REMARKS

This amendment is submitted in response to an Office Action mailed July 18, 2005. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the subject application as amended herein.

Claims 2-22 remain in the present application. Claims 1 and 23-25 were previously canceled without prejudice.

Claims 13-20 stand allowed. Given that claims 21 and 22 depend from claim 13, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 21 and 22 are allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 13 is allowed.

Claims 9-12 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claim 9, however, was amended to independent form in the previous Response filed on June 21, 2005. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 9 is allowable.

Claim 10 has been amended to convert claim 10 to independent form, including all the elements of the former base claim 2. Given that claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 10, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10-12 are now in condition for allowance.

The Specification has been amended to correct an error introduced in the previous Response filed on June 21, 2005. A new paragraph was mistakenly added to Page 6. The current amendment to the Specification moves that new paragraph to the correct location on Page 5...No new matter has been entered.

- 10 -

Atty. Docket No.: P17640 Application No.: 10/663,097 The July 18, 2005 Office Action deemed unacceptable the new drawing, Figure 9, filed in the previous Response on June 21, 2005. Specifically, the Office Action stated:

Claim 9 recites a magnetic conductor within a first frequency band and a magnetic conductor within a second frequency band. The proposed drawing (Fig. 9) shows only one magnetic conductor (910). Fig. 9 must shows two magnetic conductors specified in claim 9. If a dual band conductor (910) is capably used for both frequency bands, claim 9 should be rewrite to define only one magnetic conductor which is used for both frequency bands.

Figure 9 illustrates an embodiment of claim 9 in which an "impedance plane" comprises a "magnetic conductor within ... a first frequency band" and a "magnetic conductor within a second frequency band." In other words, in the illustrated embodiment, the impedance plane has the quality of being a magnetic conductor in one frequency band and the quality of being a magnetic conductor in another frequency band. In this embodiment, there is only one structural element (the impedence plane) that can be shown in a drawing. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that at least one embodiment of every feature of claim 9 is illustrated in the drawings. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that Figure 9 be accepted.

In the July 18, 2005 Office Action, claims 2-4 and 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,366,254 issued to Sievenpiper et al. (hereinafter "the '254 patent"). Claims 2-4 and 6-8 have been amended to depend from allowed claim 9. Therefore, for at least the reasons that claim 9 is allowed, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-4 and 6-8, as

- 11 - '

Atty. Docket No.: P17640 Application No.: 10/663,097 amended, are not anticipated by the '254 patent. Upon allowance, the claims will be renumbered so that the dependent claims follow the claims from which they depend.

In the July 18, 2005 Office Action, claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,496,155 issued to Sievenpiper et al. (hereinafter "the '155 patent"). Claim 5 has been amended to depend from allowed claim 9. Therefore, for at least the reasons that claim 9 is allowed, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 5, as amended, is not anticipated by the '155 patent. Upon allowance, the claims will be renumbered so that the dependent claims follow the claims from which they depend.

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-22 are now in a condition for allowance, and Applicant respectfully requests allowance of such claims.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to our Deposit Account No. 50-0221.

Respectfully submitted,

INTEL CORPORATION

Date: $1/(t + 1)^2$, 2005

Robert A. Diehl Reg. No. 40,992

INTEL LEGAL SC4-202 P.O. Box 5326 Santa Clara, CA 95056-5326

Phone: (503) 712-1880

FAX: (503) 264-1729